

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed September 24, 2004 has been received and reviewed. Claims 6-21 are pending. Claims 11 and 19-21 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten. No specific rejection is made against claim 18 and the Applicant assumes, therefore, that claim 18 is allowed. Claims 6-10 and 12-17 are rejected. Claims 6, 10, 12, 17 and 19 are amended. The Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons stated hereinafter.

Objection To Claim 19

Claim 19 is objected to regarding language. The correction suggested by the Examiner is made.

Rejection Of Claims 6-9 and 12-16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 6-9 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sanderson (USP 2,022,055). Responsive to the Applicant's prior amendment of claims 6 and 12, the Examiner states that Sanderson discloses a threaded spindle (3) having a projecting shoulder (7) having a centered (co-centrally centered with the axis of spindle (3)) and axially inwardly extending opening (10) configured to receive a tool for effecting rotation of the threaded spindle when the projecting shoulder is inserted within a tool part. The Applicant respectfully clarifies that, in fact, Sanderson discloses a shoulder (7) having a plurality of radially inwardly extending channels (10) each of which has an axially extending length which is aligned with the axis of the spindle, but not co-centric (i.e., not sharing the same axis) with the axis of the spindle. The channels (10) of the Sanderson device are thus configured and positioned to receive a radially inserted tool for rotation of the spindle. Further clarifying amendment of claims 6 and 12 requires that the claimed threaded spindle have a central axis and a coaxially centered, axially inwardly extending opening for receiving an axially inserted tool for effecting rotation of the spindle. The claimed invention is neither structurally nor

functionally anticipated or obviated by Sanderson and the rejection is, therefore, overcome.


Rejection Of Claims 10 and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sanderson. The Examiner repeats the prior rejection that, with respect to claim 10, Sanderson fails to disclose a device where threaded sections of a threaded spindle have differing outside diameters for being correspondingly adapted to the differing interior diameters of two tool parts, but that a change in the size of a prior art device is a design consideration within the skill in the art. With respect to claim 17, the Examiner again states that Sanderson fails to disclose a connection wherein threaded sections of a threaded spindle have differing outside diameters and threaded areas of tool pieces have correspondingly adapted interior diameters, which the Examiner again contends is a matter of design consideration within the skill in the art, citing In re Rose. The Examiner provides no further response to the Applicant's prior argument that Sanderson does not obviate claims 10 and 17. However, the Applicant again traverses the rejection and references by incorporation the Applicant's prior argument. Additionally, the Applicant submits that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves. *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). As previously argued, Sanderson provides no explicit or implicit suggestion, teaching or motivation to provide angular and axial alignment of the tool parts by providing a shoulder that effects such axial and angular alignment, because Sanderson solves axial and angular alignment by providing positioning dowels (26). Therefore, Sanderson is ineffective to establish *prima facie* obviousness of claims 10 and 17.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments made and the arguments presented, the Applicant submits that claims 6-21 present patentable subject matter. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Julie K. Morriss
Registration No. 33,263
Attorney for Applicant
MORRISS O'BRYANT COMPAGNI, P.C.
136 South Main Street, Suite 700
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: (801) 478-0071
Facsimile: (801) 478-0076

Date: November 22, 2004